



**You have downloaded a document from
RE-BUS
repository of the University of Silesia in Katowice**

Title: Power based on physical attractiveness and power based on financial resources - the influence tactics used by partners in marriage

Author: Eugenia Mandal

Citation style: Mandal Eugenia. (2012). Power based on physical attractiveness and power based on financial resources - the influence tactics used by partners in marriage W: E. Mandal (red.), "Masculinity and femininity in everyday life" (s.45-70). Katowice : Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego.



Uznanie autorstwa - Użycie niekomercyjne - Bez utworów zależnych Polska - Licencja ta zezwala na rozpowszechnianie, przedstawianie i wykonywanie utworu jedynie w celach niekomercyjnych oraz pod warunkiem zachowania go w oryginalnej postaci (nie tworzenia utworów zależnych).



UNIwersYTET ŚLĄSKI
W KATOWICACH



Biblioteka
Uniwersytetu Śląskiego



Ministerstwo Nauki
i Szkolnictwa Wyższego

CHAPTER THREE

Power based on physical attractiveness and power based on financial resources — the influence tactics used by partners in marriage

Eugenia Mandal

*Institute of Psychology
University of Silesia*

Introduction

Power is an omnipresent phenomenon. It can be perceived in the public sphere, in trade and political organizations; as well as in the private area, in intimate relationships between two people who are in love with each other, between a husband and wife, parents and children, and also between siblings. In psychology power is defined as the capacity to influence the kind and quality of outcomes of others' behaviour; as well as control over the resources which provide a power-holder with the potential to exert influence, that is to say, to alter others' behaviour (CARTWRIGHT and ZENDER, 1968; KIPNIS, 1972; FISKE, 1993; ANDERSON and BERDAHL, 2002; et al.).

In recent years the concept of power interpreted as a peculiar approach-inhibition system, has aroused considerable interest among the psychologists all over the world (the approach/inhibition theory of power by KELTNER, GRUENFELD and ANDERSON, 2003). It posits that power disturbs balance between approach and inhibition — the behavioural system appropriately related to rewards and punishments — thus affecting cognitive, emotional and behavioural processes which an individual undergoes. Possessing power encourages the tendency to approach, since power is related to a wider range of various rewards (e.g., money, respect, authority favour, praise, admiration). The powerful are also aware of the

fact that they are not inhibited by others, as there are no obstacles “in the path” to achieving the objectives which they set. Lacking power, by contrast, triggers the tendency to inhibit, since those who are low in power possess a few or no rewards, and at the same time anticipate numerous obstacles to gaining them. They are also afraid that they will lose favour with power-holders.

Power within intimate relationships can be defined as an individual's capacity to impose requirements on others, and to enforce their fulfilment; the capacity to exert one's will over another, even if the other person objects to it. Power in intimate relationships is the ability to influence one's partner in such a way as to get what one wants (BECKMAN, HARVEY, SATRE and WALKER, 1999). The origin of power is complex in nature, since it is determined by numerous factors. They include, among others, individual variables such as physical characteristics and personality traits of an individual. Research proves that certain male physical characteristics; such as considerable height, well-developed muscles, face shape characteristic of a leader; are likely to be associated with power (MUELLER and MAZUR, 1997). The main power-related personality traits include extraversion, dominance, charisma, increased social skills, Machiavellianism (cf. KELTNER, GRUENFELD and ANDERSON, 2003).

At the dyadic level, the aforementioned attributes determine the individual's power in conjunction with other factors, such as others' interest, investment, and commitment to the relationship. In intimate relationships the opportunity to withhold one's commitment and affection increases the person's power only if his or her partner values the two elements highly. When individuals have control over certain resources (e.g. material ones), their power depends on whether the other party is able to obtain those resources by alternative means (RUSBULD, 1983).

Within groups power is determined by a number of variables. They include group roles, and attached to them access to various resources; authority and status. Division of roles, and a certain hierarchy of authority and status exist also between men and women, husband and wife, and among family members. The intra-group variables are those determinants of power which affect the group differences concerning the scope of control over access to resources and punishment opportunities. These are the factors that distinguish social classes, national, ethnic, professional or the like groups from one another. Inter-group power relations may afford greater power to men over women, providing the privileged with better access to resources (e.g. high positions and earnings), or chances of making political decisions and undertaking political activity (e.g. election rights and parities) (cf. KELTNER et al., 2003). All of the aforementioned factors constitute a complex system of power deter-

minants. Their role may vary across different social contexts, and they are likely to combine in various ways.

In intimate relationships, like in other social relationships, all types of power, which were distinguished by FRENCH and RAVEL (1959), can be identified. They include: coercive power — based on the ability of an individual to administer punishments; reward power — based on the capacity of an individual to reward others; legitimate power — based on people accepting their rights and duties which stem from their functioning within a relationship; referent power — related to a person's willingness to identify with a partner; expert power — stemming from possession of knowledge and skills; and informational power — based on an individual being perceived as the source of knowledge and information. It can be observed that several types of power co-exist within each intimate relationship; however it happens quite often that one of them tends to dominate over others.

Power within relationships is relational in nature, which means it refers, to a greater extent, to the characteristics of the relationship itself rather than to an individual's traits. It is also characterized by certain dynamics and variability, and is always connected with a certain degree of asymmetry within relationships. However, dominance of one individual over another in a certain sphere might be compensated by submissiveness of the latter towards the former in another sphere, and the general interdependence is likely to be asymmetric. Power in intimate relationships may refer to making crucial decisions, which affect the fundamental activity (strategic power), as well as decisions which are related to accomplishing those tasks (executive power). At the same time, power wielded within intimate relationships can adopt various forms — from brutal violence to subtle suggestion (RODMAN, 1972; NĘCKI, 1990).

One of the most important factors affecting power relations within intimate relationships is psychological dependence of one partner on another and on their relationship. It can be assumed that, according to the "principle of least interest" (WALLER and HILL, 1951), the person less interested in the continuation of the relationship has more control over it. The reason for that is that if someone is deeply in love with the person who is less emotionally involved, then the latter is able to dictate almost all possible conditions to the infatuated individual. Another important aspect of power in relationships is the number of alternative opportunities. Those surrounded with many admirers have greater power than the individuals whose choice is limited.

Power within intimate relationships can be analysed in the context of individual resources contributed by partners. They might include: physical attractiveness and strength, intellect, various kinds of competence,

or financial resources. Many resources vary across individuals; however it is mostly in case of physical strength and material goods where gender diversification is noticed. Men are physically stronger than women; they often earn more, and occupy high social positions. Consequently, men possess greater coercive power, which is based on the opportunity to use physical strength and violence, and to have control over material goods. Power within intimate relationships is also determined by social and cultural norms concerning gender roles and expectations towards spouses and family members. In the vast majority of societies expectations towards men and women are different, and men are culturally “equipped” with family power (they are named “heads” of the family) (RODMAN, 1972).

Research indicates that power in intimate relationships is also related to sexual orientation. The results of studies prove that division of labour in homosexual couples is not as obvious as in most heterosexual ones. Power does not interact with gender. There is no dependence between physical strength, earnings, gender and power. There is no stereotypical gender division of activities and duties. Consequently, the struggle for power does not occur very often, and is not as dramatic as within heterosexual relationships. Dissatisfaction, stemming from unfairness in a relationship, is also a less common phenomenon (BLUMSTEIN and SCHWARTZ, 1983; PEPLAU, COCHRAN, ROOK and PADESKY, 1978).

Physical attractiveness plays a key role in intimate relationships. A physically attractive person is sexually attractive. Physical attractiveness belongs to the most important resources possessed by an individual involved in relationships with other people, especially of the opposite sex. Evolutionary psychologists maintain that beauty has a functional meaning, since it conveys biological message concerning natural selection; and physical attractiveness is, as they claim, a kind of erotic “bait”, which signifies high reproductive potential. The determinants of female attractiveness include: healthy rosy complexion, fleshy lips, glossy hair, and a slender figure. The male physical traits ranked attractive are: considerable height, broad shoulders, and a prominent jaw. Cross-cultural research has demonstrated that female appearance is more important in selecting a permanent partner than man’s looks. It results from the fact that most women consider the man’s material resources, or those of his features which prove that he will be able to obtain them, more important than his physical attractiveness. Hence the most desired traits are: health, intelligence, ambition, diligence (Buss, 1990). Both evolutionary and social-and-cultural perspectives of scientific research emphasize the fact that physical attractiveness plays a more important role in women’s rather than men’s life. The main determinants of male physical attrac-

tiveness are the features generally associated with strength, status and power (MUELLER and MAZUR, 1997).

Analyses of power within intimate relationships demonstrate that the earnings which the partners have and contribute to the relationship play an important role in it. Division of labour is equally important. Traditional views and cultural expectations concerning the economic aspect of family prove to be crucial. A traditional family functions on the basis of traditional division of duties. A husband is responsible for providing income, and a wife is keeping a house and taking care of children. This traditional division is not completely separate, as it happens that even in a very traditional family a man can spend a lot of time at home (e.g. watching TV), and a role of a traditional wife may include many activities outside the house (e.g. doing shopping, children's school, neighbourly relations). Division of activity spheres within a non-traditional family, where both spouses work professionally, is far more complex. In a traditional family a husband manages the financial resources. However, even in a traditional family a wife may have unlimited access to those resources, in the situation when the money a husband earns is at his wife's disposal, so that she could manage the income to satisfy the needs of the family. Managing finances may also depend on the type of tactics a wife applies to influence her husband.

Power within an intimate relationship turns out to be related to its quality and the level of satisfaction both partners derive from it. Research proves that marital satisfaction is greater when each of the partners can make decisions concerning crucial matters, and dissatisfaction appears when they have the feeling of remaining under their partner's control (BEACH and TESSER, 1993; BLOOD and WOLFE, 1960; RODMAN, 1972 et al.).

The phenomenon of power is strongly linked with social influence, the latter having been defined as the essence of power, which means the capacity to alter others' behaviour, thoughts or emotions; or it is interpreted as the consequences of holding power (FRENCH and RAVEN, 1959; KIPNIS, 1972, 1976; KIPNIS, CASTELL, GERGEN and MAUCH, 1976; DOLINSKI, 2000, 2005). Power relations, which exist in every interaction, account for the variability in social influence strategies adopted by an individual within a relationship. D. Kipnis claims that the position of power is related to using "strong" influence tactics, whereas the position of weakness requires applying "weak" tactics. Toni FALBO (1977) notices that power holders tend to engage in "direct" and "rational" tactics, while those who lack power resort to "indirect" and "non-rational" tactics.

Gender is a determinant of social influence. The pattern of influence tactics preferences is consistent with gender stereotypes. It means that females tend to use "indirect" tactics, based on helplessness and indi-

vidual resources related to social influence strategies, whereas males are more willing to employ “direct” tactics, grounded on competence and concrete resources related to social influence strategies. Men, more often than women, wield influence based on concrete resources, since they are usually physically stronger than women and have access to economic resources. Females, in contrast, exert social influence on the basis of personal resources (JOHNSON, 1976).

The findings of the survey conducted by Tony FALBO and Leticia PEPLAU (1980) among college couples proved that men adopt more “direct” and “bilateral” strategies than women. Female respondents tended to opt for “indirect” and “unilateral” tactics. The questioned with a greater sense of power in a relationship reported a larger number of indirect and bilateral strategies than those low in power. The research exploring influence tactics in the context of gender and power, carried out by Judith HOWARD, Philip BLUMENSTEIN and Pepper SCHWARTZ (1986) on hetero- and homosexual couples indicated that a lower position in power relations within intimate relationships affects the tendency to adopt “weak” tactics, i.e. supplication or manipulation, to influence a higher status partner. Conversely, a higher status in power relations involves using “strong” tactics, such as autocracy or bullying. Such tactics as negotiation and regression were discovered to be the examples of strategies not related to power. Some of the survey results proved seemingly inconsistent with power division within relationships. They revealed that professionally inactive, heterosexual women, more frequently than the active ones, were perceived by their partners as using “strong” tactics. A vast majority of them were married women. One can conclude that the very fact of holding a status of a wife seemed to justify their preference for the mentioned tactics; whereas the husbands of professionally inactive, dependent wives were likely to feel more obliged to remain in marriage than those whose wives were financially independent.

Other factors which affect social influence strategies are the feeling of satisfaction and quality of an intimate relationship. Research indicates that lack of marital satisfaction determines a preference for “indirect” strategies of social influence. Yukie AIDA and Toni FALBO (1991) found that happy spouses are less likely to adopt “indirect” tactics to influence their partner. At the same time, they identified two types of married couples: traditional marriages, in which responsibility for providing income for the family was shouldered solely by a husband; and partnership marriages, in which both spouses were working, sharing the responsibility for the financial situation of the family. The overall survey analysis proved that, in contrast with partners remaining in partnership marriages, those staying in traditional ones had not only a lower sense of

marital satisfaction, but they also reported a greater tendency to employ all types of social influence tactics. The wives in traditional marriages reported using a greater number of “indirect” tactics compared to their husbands. Generally, wives reported a stronger preference for unilateral, as well as bilateral tactics than their husbands.

There is a significant impact of culture on the use of social influence strategies. It is not only models of marriage but also social roles assigned to a woman that varies across different cultures. Generally, in traditional cultures women hold a lower social status than men. However, the more detailed research reveals that in these cultures women admittedly have lower power in relations with men, which applies mainly to sexual decision-making, but their family position is as high (or even higher) than that of males. It has also been reported in some studies that the women who lack economic power tend to use “strong” tactics to influence their husbands (BELK et al., 1988, 1999).

There are some behavioural differences in the social influence strategies which males and females adopt in intimate relationships. The variety of behavioural patterns includes both “positive” behaviours — nice and pleasant for the partner; and “negative” ones — mean, humiliating, scary and frightening. In the research into intimate relationships David BUSS, Mary GOMES, Dolly HIGGINS and Karen LAUTERBACH (1987) identified several types of tactics of manipulation which occur within intimate relationships, including: Reason, Charm, Silent Treatment, Coercion, Regression, and Debasement. The researchers revealed individual difference consistency across the context of goals toward which the tactics are directed, i.e. behavioural instigation (getting another to do something, encouraging or even egging on the partner to do something), and behavioural termination (getting another to stop doing something, discouraging, dissuading the partner from doing something). The survey proved that the most popular type of tactics among college couples was Reason, and the less frequently used one was Debasement. Partners in the aforementioned relationships were more likely to use “positive” tactics, i.e. Charm, for behavioural instigation; and “negative” tactics, such as Silent Treatment or Coercion, for behavioural termination.

The aim of the studies carried out by the author of this article was to examine social influence strategies adopted in intimate relationships, in the context of power and its types. The survey was conducted among formal relationships — married couples. A large body of psychological research into influence strategies focuses on examining young people, usually college students, remaining in intimate dating relationships. Such relationships are not always based on intimacy and commitment; they do not always last long, and are characteristic for their great sense of freedom. This sense

of freedom endows the partners with the conviction that they can easily withhold their commitment, and that they hold control over their partner rather than are controlled by another person. Formal relationships, in contrast, are usually long-term and long-standing, based on a great sense of commitment, and the relation concerning holding and yielding to power is relatively stable and complex. The sense of holding and succumbing to power may be different in formal and informal relationships.

The study is based on the assumption that there are various behavioural differences between the influence strategies adopted within intimate relationships. The variety of behavioural patterns includes both “positive” and “negative” reactions. The following tactics of social influence occurring in intimate relationships have been identified: (1) the charm tactics (the tactics of enchanting) — involves using personal charm and sex appeal, being nice and romantic to the partner; (2) the supplication tactics — based on being submissive, humble, servile to a partner, agreeing with him or her, crying; (3) the reason tactics — involves providing reasons and explanations, addressing direct questions, pointing out positive and negative outcomes of the particular behaviour; (4) the sulk tactics — based on being sulky with a partner, making sour faces and showing bad moods; (5) the tactics of silent treatment — remaining silent, ignoring and not talking to a partner, it is as it were “freezing” another with one’s behaviour; the period when partners do not talk to each other is in Polish colloquially referred to as “silent days”; (6) the coercion tactics — involves making direct categorical demands, shouting, swearing, using threat and violence towards a partner. The taxonomy presented above has been devised based on the variety of behavioral patterns occurring within intimate relationships, which have been described in the literature (BUSS, GOMES, HIGGINS, LAUTERBACH, 1987; HOWARD, BLUMSTEIN and SCHWARTZ, 1986; AIDA and FALBO, 1991; WHITE, 1988).

The hypothesis put forward in the study predicts that the strategies adopted by individuals to influence their spouses are determined mainly by the type of power they hold. The following variables related to power relations within married couples were examined: a sense of self-rated attractiveness, assessment of partner’s attractiveness, financial relations (earnings: husband-wife relation), relations concerning physical attractiveness (self-rated attractiveness vs. partner’s attractiveness). The study also diagnosed a subjective sense of marital satisfaction among spouses. Other characteristics of partners within married couples were also taken into consideration. They included: sex, age, marriage duration, number of children, financial situation, occupation, occupational prestige (high, medium, low) and a degree of intensity of psychological femininity and masculinity among the surveyed wives and husbands composing married couples.

Method

Measures

The questionnaire used in this study to measure manipulative tactics applied in intimate relationships is the one composed by David Buss and the co-researchers (Buss et al., 1987), and adapted by the author of this research (MANDAL, 2005). The author has translated the scale and selected 24 out of 35 items describing various patterns of behaviour associated with influencing (manipulating) a partner; choosing the items with the highest loading on the scale (cf. Buss et al., 1987). Each of the following tactics: charm, reason and coercion, was measured using 5 items; 4 of the scale items pertained to silent treatment tactics; 3 items were related to the supplication tactics; and 2 — to the sulk strategy. The questionnaire instruction was modified by the author of the study. In the original version the surveyed were addressed 2 individual questions concerning the instigation and inhibition tactics used to influence their partners. In the Polish version of the questionnaire, in contrast, the survey participants were asked one composite question: “What do you do to make your partner do (or stop doing) something for you?” In order to answer the question, the surveyed were supposed to respond to a range of 24 possible behavioural patterns describing the 6 aforementioned tactics of exerting influence on a partner. Respondents rated their items using a 7-point scale. Their responses ranged from 1 = “I never do it” to 7 = “I do it most often.”

Another method used in the present study is the Inventory for Psychological Gender Evaluation (Polish: IPP) (KUCZYŃSKA, 1992), which is a Polish adaptation of the BEM Sex Role Inventory (BSRI) (1974). The questionnaire comprises two scales: the Scale of Femininity and the Scale of Masculinity, both of which consist of 15 items, diagnosing psychological femininity and masculinity. The reliability ratio for the masculinity scale is $r_{tt} = .783$, and for the femininity scale — $r_{tt} = .785$.

Demographic variables were measured in this study by using a questionnaire devised by the author of this paper. It consisted of ten questions concerning the respondents' personal data, such as: sex, age, marriage duration, number of children, financial situation, and occupation. In addition to that, the subjects were also requested to rate their own and their partner's physical attractiveness on scales of 1 to 7, where 1 = *not very attractive*, and 7 = *very attractive*. The participants used a similar scale to describe their subjective sense of marital satisfaction, re-

porting the range of ratings concerning their marriage from 1 = *not very happy* to 7 = *very happy*.

Power based on financial resources was operationalized as husband-wife relations concerning earnings. They were measured via participants' choice of the statement concerning their own and their partner's income. Subjects were supposed to select one out of all possible financial wife-husband relations provided in the questionnaire. The range of statements included: (1) "My partner is not gainfully employed." (2) "I earn much more than my partner." (3) "I earn more than my partner." (4) "Our earnings are at a similar level." (5) "My partner earns more than me." (6) "My partner earns much more than me." (7) "I am not gainfully employed." It was assumed in the study that the scores from 1 to 3 were interpreted as financial control over a partner; 4 denoted spouses' equal financial power; the scores from 5 to 7 were interpreted as an individual being financially controlled by another party. High scores corresponded to a high level of partner's financial control over another individual.

Power based on physical attractiveness was operationalized as wife-husband relations concerning physical attractiveness. It was measured by means of a score representing a difference between spouses' ratings of the following two items: self-attractiveness (evaluated on a 1—7 scale) and partner's attractiveness (measured on a 1—7 scale). The score was formed by subtracting the spouse's rating of partner's physical attractiveness from the respondent's self-rating of his or her own physical attractiveness. A positive result of the subtraction (> 0 to 6) denoted a sense of control (advantage) of one spouse over another in terms of physical attractiveness. A negative result, in contrast, (< 0 to -6) implied that an individual remains under a spouse's control in terms of physical attractiveness. The higher the subtraction score, the greater control over a spouse.

Subjects

Subjects for the study were 184 individuals composing 92 married couples. The survey data were collected from the married couples recruited from married students in various faculties at the University of Silesia; as well as members of their families (predominantly parents and grandparents) and acquaintances. Their participation in the survey was anonymous and voluntary.

The youngest respondent was 22 years old, whereas the oldest one was 82. The mean age (M) of the surveyed wives was 43.36 (SD = 16.44), and the mean age of the surveyed husbands was 45.90 (SD = 16.58). The

shortest marriage duration among the surveyed couples was 3 months; the longest one was 56 years. The marriage duration was respectively $M = 21.13$ ($SD = 16.54$ years). The average number of children per surveyed married couple was one child ($M = 1.36$), and the highest was 4 children.

Results

Descriptive statistics concerning the sample group of spouses revealed that the surveyed wives, more frequently than husbands, reported cases of being financially controlled by their partners. The wives' mean score was $M = 4.99$ and it referred to the response (5) "My partner earns more than me." The husbands' mean score was $M = 3.02$, and it referred to the response (3) "I earn more than my partner", $t(182) = 9.42$, $p < .00001$, $Z = 8.08$, $p < .00001$. However, the surveyed husbands more frequently than wives reported yielding to partner's power based on physical attractiveness. At the same time, both wives and husbands rated their partners as being slightly more attractive than themselves. The wives' mean score for self-rated attractiveness was $M = 4.79$, whereas the average score they received for evaluation of their partners' attractiveness was $M = 5.30$. Husbands' score for self-assessment of their attractiveness was $M = 4.67$, and their score for evaluation of partner's attractiveness amounted to $M = 5.641$. As statistics indicated, $t(182) = 2.51$, $p < .01$, among the surveyed individuals who rated their partners' attractiveness higher than their own, the average score received by wives ($M = -.51$) was higher than the one achieved by husbands ($M = -.97$) (measured on a 7-point scale). What is more, data analysis proved that husbands assessed their wives' attractiveness slightly higher, compared to wives evaluating their husbands' attractiveness, $t(182) = -1.74$, $p < .08$, $Z = 1.83$, $p < .07$, statistical tendency.

The study analysis revealed certain statistically significant differences between husbands and wives, concerning spouses' psychological femininity and masculinity. Wives ($M = 57.41$) demonstrated a higher degree of femininity than their husbands ($M = 49.92$) ($t(182) = 6.79$, $p < .00001$, $Z = 6.063$, $p < .00001$). Husbands ($M = 52.23$), in contrast, were more masculine than their wives ($M = 47.07$) ($t(182) = -4.03$, $p < .00001$, $Z = -4.33$, $p < .0001$). However, no differences concerning a sense of marital satisfaction were discerned between wives and husbands. There were not any statistically significant differences between wives' and husbands'

ratings of satisfaction they derived from their own relationships. Both surveyed groups rated the level of marital satisfaction as relatively high: wives' score was $M = 5.70$, whereas the score received by husbands was $M = 5.79$ on a 7-point scale (p — not significant) (Table 1).

Table 1. Characteristics of the surveyed wives and husbands ($N = 184$)

Variables	Wives ($N = 92$)		Husbands ($N = 92$)		$t(182)$	p	Z	p
	M	SD	M	SD				
Marriage duration	21.13	16.58	21.13	16.58	0.00	1.00	.00	1.00
Age	43.36	16.45	45.90	16.58	-1.05	.30	-1.39	.16
Number of children	1.36	1.01	1.36	1.01	.00	1.00	.00	1.00
Financial situation	3.48	.72	3.49	.70	-.10	.92	-.26	.79
Femininity	57.41	7.65	49.92	7.33	6.79	.0001	6.06	.0001
Masculinity	47.09	8.48	52.23	8.48	-4.03	.0001	-4.33	.0001
Occupational prestige	1.91	.70	1.76	.70	1.36	.17	1.38	.17
Financial relations*	4.99	1.43	3.02	1.41	9.42	.0001	8.08	.0001
Self-attractiveness	4.79	1.21	4.67	1.04	.72	.73	1.28	.20
Partner's attractiveness	5.30	1.34	5.64	1.29	-1.74	.08	-1.83	.07
Relations of attractiveness**	-.51	1.16	-.97	1.30	2.51	.01	2.80	.005
Marriage satisfaction	5.70	1.14	5.79	1.14	-.58	.56	-.67	.50

* Financial relations — higher scores denote partner's greater financial control.

** Relations of attractiveness — a result of subtraction: self-rated attractiveness minus spouse's attractiveness; a positive result denotes power over a partner, whereas a negative result equals remaining under a spouse's control based on physical attractiveness.

When it comes to the choice of influence strategies adopted to influence a partner within a relationship, a vast majority of the respondents declared their preference for the reason tactic ($M = 4.65$, $SD = 1.23$). Other popular strategies were: the tactic of sulks ($M = 3.32$, $SD = 1.82$), the silent treatment tactic ($M = 2.82$, $SD = 1.51$), charm tactic ($M = 2.77$, $SD = 1.21$), coercive tactic ($M = 2.50$, $SD = 1.24$). The least frequently reported strategy was the supplication tactic ($M = 1.61$, $SD = 1.74$). Certain statistically significant differences concerning the manipulative tactics were found between the scores received by husbands and wives. They referred predominantly to the tactic of sulks, which was reported more frequently by wives ($M = 3.82$) than husbands ($M = 2.82$) ($t(182) = 3.85$, $p < .0001$, $Z = 3.82$, $p < .001$). Some minor differences related to the silent treatment tactic, which wives tended to adopt a little more often than husbands (the respective scores are: $M = 3.07$ and $M = 2.57$) ($t(182) = 2.27$, $p < .02$, $Z = 2.49$, $p < .01$); and the supplication strategy, which similarly was more popular with wives ($M = 2.69$) rather

than husbands ($M = 2.31$) ($t(182) = 2.09$, $p < .04$, $Z = 2.13$, $p < .03$) (cf. Table 2).

Table 2. Influence tactics used in marriage reported by the surveyed wives ($N = 92$) and husbands ($N = 92$)

Influence tactic	Wives		Husbands		$t(182)$	P	U	Z	P
	M	SD	M	SD					
1. Charm	2.74	1.24	2.78	1.19	-.32	.75	4102.5	-.36	.72
2. Debasement	1.59	0.69	1.63	0.79	-.33	.74	8490.0	.05	.95
3. Reason	4.80	1.22	4.50	1.23	1.67	.09	3633.0	1.66	.09
4. Silent treatment	3.81	1.86	2.81	1.66	3.85	.0001	7131.0	3.82	.0001
5. Sulk	3.07	1.50	2.57	1.49	2.27	.02	3332.5	2.49	.01
6. Coercion	2.69	1.29	2.31	1.17	2.09	.04	3461.5	2.13	.03

The further data gathered in the survey were examined in terms of the spouses' personal resources. It was assumed that they vary between wives and husbands, and are determined by marriage duration, financial situation, physical attractiveness and a sense of marital satisfaction. At the same time, these resources are likely to correlate with other resources and manipulative tactics used within marriage. Correlative analyses of ranks revealed a strong correlation between marriage duration and the age of wives ($R = .95$) and husbands ($R = .95$). The more mature age, the longer marriage duration was observed. In terms of age, the surveyed spouses' resources were similar, since they composed predominantly couples in which partners were at the similar age. Marriage duration was also found to correlate strongly with a number of children (the number reported by the survey participants ranged from 0 to 4 children) ($R = .61$, $p < .0001$). Thus, taking into account the number of children, the surveyed spouses' resources were identical. In case of wives (but not in case of husbands) marriage duration correlated negatively with occupational status ($R = -.23$, $p < .03$). A great number of the surveyed women had higher education (or they were students) or were professionally inactive.

Taking into consideration financial power, it was found that women's financial dependence on husbands decreased as the marriage duration lengthened ($R = -.24$, $p < .02$). Conversely, within the group of men a positive correlation was revealed ($R = .20$, $p < -.06$ statistical tendency).

The results of the survey demonstrated that marriage duration correlated with evaluation of partner's physical attractiveness. The correlation was negative: longer marriage duration affected wives' increasing-

ly low ratings of their husbands' physical attractiveness ($R = -.48$, $p < .00001$), and husbands' low ratings of their wives' physical attractiveness ($R = -.46$, $p < .00001$). Partner's physical attractiveness was rated most highly by the spouses in short-married couples. It was found that longer marriage duration influenced also husbands' and wives' increasingly low self-ratings of their own physical attractiveness (the scores received by wives and husbands were statistical respectively: $R = -.42$, $p < .00001$ and $R = -.36$, $p < .0005$).

Husbands' and wives' psychological masculinity correlated negatively with marriage duration (husbands: $R = -.32$, $p < .002$; wives: $R = -.40$, $p < .0001$). It means that both partners within shorter married duration couples were more masculine than their counterparts in the couples with longer marriage duration. Whereas femininity of both wives and husbands was found not to be affected by marriage duration. The study also demonstrated that a sense of happiness among both wives ($R = -.36$, $p < .0005$) and husbands ($R = -.43$, $p < .00001$) lowered as marriage duration lengthened (Table 3).

Table 3. Marriage duration versus wives' and husbands' selected personal resources. Spearman correlation ratio (R)

Personal resources	Wives			Husbands		
	R	t(90)	P	R	t(90)	P
1. Age	.95	30.02	.0001	.95	29.87	.00001
2. Children	.61	7.27	.0001	.61	7.27	.00001
3. Financial situation	-.17	-1.65	n.sign.*	-.17	-1.67	n.sign.
4. Occupational prestige	-.23	-2.23	.03	-.07	-0.65	n.sign.
5. Financial relations	-.24	-2.23	.02	.20	1.89	.06
6. Partner's attractiveness	-.48	-5.15	.0001	-.46	-4.86	.0001
7. Self-attractiveness	-.42	-4.35	.0001	-.36	-3.62	.001
8. Relations of attractiveness	.12	1.16	n.sign.	.15	1.40	n.sign.
9. Marriage satisfaction	-.36	-3.61	.001	-.43	-4.49	.0001
10. Femininity	-.15	-1.47	n.sign.	-.06	-0.58	n.sign.
11. Masculinity	-.40	-4.09	.0001	-.32	-3.12	.002

* Not significant.

Examination of the relation between marriage duration and the tactics used to influence a partner revealed a few statistically significant correlations. One of them was a positive correlation between marriage duration and husbands' preference for the coercion tactics ($R = .22$, $p < .04$). Whereas wives' responses proved that marriage duration cor-

related negatively with two frequently reported by them tactics: charm ($R = -.25$, $p < .01$) and reason ($R = -.28$, $p < .01$) (Table 4).

Table 4. Marriage duration versus influence tactics used by wives and husbands in marriage. Spearman correlation ratio (R)

Influence tactic	Wives			Husbands		
	R	t(90)	p	R	t(90)	P
1. Charm	-.25	-2.43	.01	-.09	-0.84	n.sign.
2. Debasement	.02	.18	n.sign.*	.02	0.23	n.sign.
3. Reason	-.28	-2.75	.01	-.06	-0.60	n.sign.
4. Silent treatment	.13	1.24	n.sign.	.09	0.85	n.sign.
5. Sulk	-.06	-.59	n.sign.	.09	0.23	n.sign.
6. Coertion	.12	1.15	n.sign.	.22	2.10	.04

* Not significant.

Further survey analysis aimed at examining possible correlations between spouses' resources and their preferences for particular strategies adopted to influence a partner. Taking into consideration power based on financial resources, as a factor determining the choice of a particular manipulative strategy within marriage, it was discovered that the fact that wives remained under their husbands' control correlated negatively with the tendency to use only one influence tactics — coercion ($R = -.24$, $p < .02$). Whereas wives' financial control over their husbands was found to correlate positively with husbands' preference for the coercion tactics ($R = .31$, $p < .01$). A positive correlation with the tactic of silent treatment, used by men to influence wives, was also discovered in the aforementioned group of husbands ($R = .25$, $p < .02$) (Table 5).

Table 5. Power based on financial resources versus influence tactics used by wives and husbands in marriage. Spearman correlation ratio (R)

Influence tactic	Wives			Husbands		
	R	t(90)	P	R	t(90)	P
1. Charm	.14	1.32	n.sign.*	.19	1.87	.06
2. Debasement	.11	1.09	n.sign.	.08	0.74	n.sign.
3. Reason	-.02	-0.02	n.sign.	.12	1.11	n.sign.
4. Silent treatment	-.03	-0.27	n.sign.	.25	2.43	.02
5. Sulk	-.07	-0.72	n.sign.	.17	1.66	n.sign.
6. Coertion	-.24	-2.33	0.02	.31	3.12	.01

* Not significant.

The study results showed that wives' power based on their physical attractiveness correlated positively with the tactic of coercion ($R = .21$, $p < .04$). Among the surveyed husbands two statistical tendencies were discerned. They referred to the fact that husbands' control over their wives, based on physical attractiveness, correlated positively with their preference for the tactic of silent treatment ($R = .19$, $p < .07$), and a lower tendency to adopt the tactic of reason ($R = -.19$, $p < .07$) (Table 6).

Table 6. Power based on physical attractiveness versus influence tactics used by wives and husbands in marriage. Spearman correlation ratio (R)

Influence tactic	Wives			Husbands		
	R	t(90)	P	R	t(90)	P
1. Charm	-.12	-1.11	n.sign.*	-.01	-.01	n.sign.
2. Debasement	-.04	-0.41	n.sign.	.01	.04	n.sign.
3. Reason	-.08	-0.74	n.sign.	-.19	-1.83	.07
4. Silent treatment	.12	1.17	n.sign.	.19	1.86	.06
5. Sulk	.11	1.05	n.sign.	.15	1.44	n.sign.
6. Coertion	.21	2.09	.04	.14	1.35	n.sign.

* Not significant.

Analysis of manipulative tactics employed within a marriage, conducted in terms of a sense of marital satisfaction demonstrated that in case of husbands, satisfaction correlated negatively with their preference for the use of coercive tactic to influence their wives ($R = -.39$, $p < .001$). A similar statistical tendency was discerned among wives ($R = .26$, $p < .08$). There was also a negative correlation between husbands' sense of marital satisfaction and their preference for the tactic of silent treatment ($R = -.25$, $p < .02$), whereas wives' sense of marital satisfaction correlated positively with the tendency to adopt two types of tactic to manipulate their husbands: charm ($R = .31$, $p < .01$) and reason ($R = .25$, $p < .01$) (Table 7).

In the further stage of the study examination, 12 multiple stepwise regression analyses were conducted, 6 analyses for each of the two surveyed groups — husbands and wives. Separate analyses were carried out to explore all dependent variables, which were the particular types of tactics adopted by spouses within marriage to influence a partner.

The results indicated that within a group of surveyed wives the predictors determining their preference for the charm tactic were such variables as a high sense of marital satisfaction ($\beta = .25$), a good financial

Table 7. Marital satisfaction and influence tactics used by wives and husbands in marriage. Spearman correlation ratio (R)

Influence tactic	Wives			Husbands		
	R	t(90)	p	R	t(90)	P
1. Charm	.31	3.10	.01	.09	.88	n.sign.
2. Debasement	.09	0.85	n.sign.*	.07	.68	n.sign.
3. Reason	.25	2.48	.01	.16	1.58	n.sign.
4. Silent treatment	-.12	-1.13	n.sign.	-.25	-2.41	.02
5. Sulk	-.09	-.84	n.sign.	-.11	-1.03	n.sign.
6. Coercion	-.18	-1.77	.08	-.39	-4.00	.0001

* Not significant.

situation ($\beta = .20$, $p < .03$) and the fact of having a smaller number of children ($\beta = -.22$, $p < .02$). The variance in the dependent variables accounted for by the independent variables was relatively high and amounted to 20% ($R^2 = .19$, $F(4.87) = 5.27$, $p < .0007$). Wives' low sense of self-attractiveness was the predictor determining the preference for the tactic of silent treatment used to manipulate their husbands ($\beta = -.22$, $p < .05$). The women who rated their own attractiveness low reported more frequently using this tactic in their marriage. The explained dependent variance amounted to approximately 5% ($R^2 = .05$, $F(2.89) = 2.26$, $p < .10$).

It was found that the predictor affecting wives' preference for the coercion tactic in marriage ($R^2 = .09$, $F(4.87) = 2.09$, $p < .08$) was power over husbands based on wives' physical attractiveness, that is to say, the result of comparison of ratings concerning their own and their husbands' attractiveness, which turned out to be positive for the female respondents ($\beta = .23$, $p < .04$). The explained variance in this case amounted to approximately 9% ($R^2 = .09$, $F(4.87) = 2.09$, $p < .08$).

Multiple regression analysis revealed that a high sense of marital satisfaction ($\beta = .22$, $p < .03$) and masculinity of wives ($\beta = .22$, $p < .03$) are the predictors determining the preference for the use of the reason tactics in marriage. The explained variance was estimated at 11% ($R^2 = .11$, $F(2.89) = 5.53$, $p < .005$). Wives' longer marriage duration was discovered to be the predictor of the supplication tactics ($\beta = .27$, $p < .04$). The explained variance was close to 6% ($R^2 = .06$, $F(3.88) = 1.79$, $p < .15$). None of the regression ratios reached its statistical significance at any stage of the regression analysis of the supplication tactics adopted by wives (cf. Table 8).

Table 8. Predictors of influence tactics used by wives. Finding summary of six multiple regression analyses (final stage) examining particular tactics

Influence tactic	Variables	β	t	p	R ²
1. Charm	children	-.22	-2.14	.03	.19
	financial situation	.20	2.08	.04	
	occupational prestige	-.17	-1.66	.10	
	marriage satisfaction	.25	2.46	.01	
2. Debasement	marriage duration	.27	2.10	.04	.06
	children	-.19	-1.51	.13	
	financial relations	.13	1.21	.23	
3. Reason	marriage satisfaction	.22	2.16	.03	.11
	masculinity	.22	2.16	.03	
4. Silent treatment	self-attractiveness	-.22	-2.00	.05	.05
	relations of attractiveness	.15	1.40	.16	
5. Sulk					n.sign.*
6. Coertion	occupational prestige	-.11	-1.05	.29	.09
	financial relations	-.14	-1.34	.18	
	self-attractiveness	-.12	-1.10	.27	
	relations of attractiveness	.23	2.04	.04	

* Not significant — in the stepwise regression analysis none of the variables received statistical significance.

Data gathered from the surveyed husbands proved that the predictors determining their preference for the charm tactics were such factors as psychological masculinity of husbands ($\beta = .28$, $p < .007$) and low financial power (i.e. husbands' less favourable financial position within a wife-husband relationship) ($\beta = .28$, $p < .008$). The variables examined in the survey accounted for the approximate 12% of charm-variable variance ($R^2 = .12$, $F(2.89) = 5.99$, $p < .003$).

Husbands' worse financial situation ($\beta = -.25$, $p < .01$) and a low sense of marital satisfaction ($\beta = -.27$, $p < .008$) were found to be the predictors of their preference for the silent treatment tactics. The dependent variance accounted for by the set of independent variables amounted to approximately 14% ($R^2 = .15$, $F(2.89) = 7.61$, $p < .0008$).

Husbands' low sense of marital satisfaction turned out to be a strong predictor of their preference for the use of coercive tactics ($\beta = -.52$, $p < .000001$). The explained variance in this case was relatively high and amounted to approximately 27% ($R^2 = .27$, $F(1.90) = 33.15$, $p < .000001$).

It was found that the predictors of husbands preference for the reason tactics are such factors as their masculinity ($\beta = .36$, $p < .0006$), a better financial situation ($\beta = .29$, $p < .004$), a lower sense of self-attractiveness ($\beta = -.22$, $p < .02$) and a lower level of financial power ($\beta = .21$,

$p < .03$). It is also in this case that the amount of the dependent variance, accounted for by the independent variables, was high and reached approximately 28% ($R^2 = .28$, $F(4.87) = 8.68$, $p < .00001$).

Husbands' worse financial situation ($\beta = -.31$, $p < .003$) and their psychological femininity ($\beta = .22$, $p < .03$ ($R^2 = .12$, $F(2.89) = 6.04$, $p < .003$)) were discovered to be the predictors of the tendency among husbands to adopt the tactics of sulks. The explained variance estimated in this case amounted to approximately 12% ($R^2 = .12$, $F(2.89) = 6.04$, $p < .003$).

Husbands' femininity also turned out to be the predictor affecting their preference for the supplication tactics ($\beta = .24$, $p < .02$). The approximate amount of the explained variance was 6% ($R^2 = .06$, $F(1.90) = 5.63$, $p < .01$) (Table 9).

Table 9. Predictors of influence tactics used by husbands. Finding summary of six multiple regression analyses (final stage) examining particular strategies

Influence tactic	Variables	β	t	p	R^2
1. Charm	financial relations	.27	2.70	.01	.12
	masculinity	.28	2.72	.01	
2. Debasement	femininity	.24	2.37	.02	.06
3. Reason	financial situation	.29	2.96	.01	.28
	financial relations	.20	2.19	.03	
	self-attractiveness	-.22	-2.29	.02	
	masculinity	.36	3.54	.01	
4. Silent treatment	financial situation	-.25	-2.57	.01	.15
	marriage satisfaction	-.27	-2.70	.01	
5. Sulk	financial situation	-.31	-3.03	.01	.12
	femininity	.22	2.19	.03	
6. Coertion	marriage satisfaction	-.52	-5.58	.00001	.27

Discussion

The present research aimed at exploring the strategies of social influence adopted within intimate relationships, namely marriage. The surveyed spouses constituted a group of respondents who reported relatively high ratings of satisfaction within their own relationships, as well as their partners' physical attractiveness. The survey results also indicated that the spouses rated their partners' attractiveness higher than their own

looks, which referred predominantly to the group of husbands. Wives were found to be more psychologically feminine than their husbands, and husbands — more masculine than their wives. The survey analysis demonstrated that the power which husbands wielded in marriage was predominantly based on financial resources, whereas the one possessed by wives was related to their own physical attractiveness. Similar relations of power based on a sense of marital satisfaction were reported by both groups of respondents. Wives turned out to be more psychologically feminine than husbands, whereas the latter were discovered to be more masculine than wives.

When it comes to the spouses' preference for the use of influence strategies in marriage, they most frequently reported the tactic of reason. The less popular strategies among the survey participants were: sulks, silent treatment (the so-called "silent days"), charm and coercion. The supplication tactic was found to be the least popular. These results emphasize the spouses' preference for "direct" and "positive" tactics. Reason is a "direct" strategy, since it involves stating direct reasons for which a spouse tries to achieve a desired pattern of behaviour on the part of his or her partner. It is considered to be one of the most effective strategies of social influence. Charm is an example of a "positive" tactic, as it is related to displaying pleasant behavioural patterns which increase the partner's self-esteem.

The strategy least frequently adopted by the surveyed spouses was supplication, which is associated with showing weakness, partner-depreciating; and poses a threat to the subject's self-rating. This seems to be the reason the respondents tended to avoid in their responses. The research analysis indicated that there were certain differences between husbands and wives, concerning their preference for the particular manipulative tactics employed to influence their partner within marriage. Wives, more frequently than husbands, reported their tendency to use "indirect" tactics, such as sulks and silent treatment. The tactic of sulks conforms more to the female rather than the male stereotype, since a "sulky-looking" man is not perceived as "manly."

The overall research results confirm numerous assumptions indicating that the preference for the use of "indirect" manipulative tactics is higher among females than within a group of males. The surveyed wives, more frequently than the surveyed husbands, reported the tactic of coercion. Similar findings, received by American researchers (HOWARD, BLUMSTEIN and SCHWARTZ, 1986; BECKMAN et al., 1999), demonstrated that women in married couples are able to employ "strong" strategies of social influence. It is accounted by the fact that such females have a sense of power over their partners, which results from a formal character

of marriage, and the conviction that this kind of relations makes husbands obliged to be loyal.

The present research indicated that as marriage duration lengthened, husbands' preference for the use of coercive tactics to influence their wives gradually grew; whereas the surveyed wives declared their growing unwillingness to use the reason or charm tactics to manipulate their husbands. It may be both the consequence and reason of the fact that as time passes fascination and infatuation with a partner is fading away, closeness is disappearing, and the relationship between the partners is deteriorating. Gradually, over time, wives appear to be less willing to adopt "positive" manipulative tactics, such as charm or reason; whereas among husbands there is a growing tendency to engage in "negative" strategies to influence their wives.

The study analysis revealed that the predictors determining the preference for the use of manipulative strategies within marriage are various factors. It was discovered that among the surveyed wives the predictors affecting their tendency to employ the charm tactics included such factors as a high sense of marital satisfaction, a good financial situation and a fact of having a smaller number of children. A high sense of marital satisfaction and psychological masculinity of wives were found to be the predictors of the reason tactics. It can be concluded that "positive" influence strategies, reported by the group of surveyed wives, are determined by a good marital situation, i.e. a sense of happiness, a good financial situation, and fewer childcare duties. Whereas wives' masculinity is associated with exerting "direct" influence on their husbands.

The study findings demonstrated that the predictor influencing wives' preference for coercive tactic was the power over husbands based on their physical attractiveness. Wives' low sense of their own physical attractiveness turned out to be the predictor of the silent treatment strategy. It means that physical attractiveness provides wives with a sense of power over their husbands, and increases their readiness to employ "indirect" influence strategies. Lack of attractiveness, in contrast, determines wives' preference for the silent treatment tactic. It was found that the predictor of the supplication tactics adopted by wives was longer marriage duration. Presumably, it results from the fact that gradually, over time, wives tend not to perceive supplication as self-depreciation. They use the tactic, not noticing or disregarding the threat it might pose to their self-esteem.

The research indicated that within a group of husbands the predictors influencing their preference for the charm tactic include such factors as husbands' psychological masculinity and the lower financial control

over wives. The two aforementioned factors, combined with husbands' sense of self-attractiveness and a better financial situation within marriage, were discovered to be the predictors of the reason tactic. A worse financial situation within marriage and husbands' low sense of marital satisfaction turned out to be the predictors affecting their preference for the tactics of silent treatment. A low sense of marital satisfaction was also the predictor of coercive tactics. Factors such as a worse financial situation within marriage and husbands' psychological femininity were discovered the predictors determining husbands' preference for the tactics of sulks. The predictor of the supplication tactics adopted by husbands was their femininity. Thus it can be deduced that husbands' masculinity and lower financial power over wives are the factors which favour husbands' tendency to employ "positive" influence strategies, such as reason and charm; whereas the predictors of "negative" tactics include such factors as a worse financial situation and a low sense of marital satisfaction. Husbands' femininity was found to be the predictor of the supplication tactic. This strategy is associated with the fact that supplication and submissiveness are more feminine in nature.

The overall survey findings indicate that the subjective sense of financial well-being and marital satisfaction, as well as the type of power over a partner, significantly determine the preference for the use of particular types of manipulative tactics in marriage. The study demonstrated that the sense of marital satisfaction gradually decreased as the duration of marriage lengthened. The reasons underlying this fact are the problems and conflicts which arise in married life, as well as the growing load of household chores and childcare duties. It was revealed that wives' high sense of marital satisfaction determined their preference for the use of "positive" influence tactics, such as charm and argumentation. A low sense of marital satisfaction, in contrast, affected both spouses' tendency to engage in "strong" and "negative" tactics of coercion. In case of husbands, a low sense of marital satisfaction was also related to their preference for the use of an "indirect" and "negative" strategy of silent treatment. Thus a sense of happiness is a factor which favours adopting "positive" and "direct" strategies of influence in marriage.

Analysis of the gathered data also indicated that remaining under partner's financial power was in case of women related to avoiding coercive tactics; and in case of men, it affected their tendency to use the aforementioned strategy. Partner's financial power correlated with marriage duration. This correlation differed across genders. Wives were financially dependent on their husbands predominantly at a young age and in the early stage of their marriage. Conversely, men tended to be

more financially dependent on their wives with increasing age and as the duration of their marriage lengthened. In case of young women this dependence can be explained by the fact that in the early stages of marriage they have to take care of their small children. Middle-aged or older women, having raised their children, are professionally active. It happens quite often that in this stage of life spouses' earnings (or pensions) are at a similar level, or wives' income is even higher than their husbands' one. Power relations are likely to explain the survey outcome showing that husbands' power correlated with wives' decreased tendency to engage in "direct" coercive tactic to influence their husbands. Usually, individuals who remain under others' control do not opt for "direct" manipulative tactics. Within marriage, strong infatuation with a partner, characteristic for the early stages of the relationship, and a traditional division of marriage roles, which conforms to the stereotypes of femininity and masculinity, may explain lower tendency among wives to employ "strong" manipulative strategies.

The present research demonstrated that husbands remaining under financial power of their wives tend to adopt "strong" tactics of influence, such as coercion and silent treatment. Both strategies are "negative" in nature, and take the form of "indirect" and "direct" aggression. However, the same aforementioned husbands are also inclined apply a "positive" influence tactic which involves using charm to influence their more financially resourceful wives, which generates a variety of behavioural patterns determined by husbands' power associated with punishing and rewarding.

Holding financial power within marriage is traditionally linked with a male role, whereas succumbing to it is associated with a female position. Nowadays, those traditionally established relations undergo certain changes. Both spouses tend to receive similar earnings, or it happens that wives earn even more than their husbands. It is a common case that husbands are unemployed and their wives are breadwinners in the family. The data gathered in the survey prove that husbands do not come to terms with remaining under their wives' financial power, they do not feel "manly" or happy in the relationship, and they seem to place the blame for this situation predominantly on their own wives. They also tend to adopt the behavioural patterns based on coercive tactics to manipulate their wives. Conversely, compared with men, women avoid the aforementioned strategy of influence.

The present analysis revealed that power based on physical attractiveness was related to the tendency, especially among wives, to employ "strong" manipulative tactics. Within the group of surveyed wives, this type of power over a partner was related to wives' preference for the

use of “strong” coercive tactics. In contrast, husbands whose power over wives was based on a high sense of self-rated physical attractiveness tended to engage in “indirect” strategies, such as silent treatment; and were unwilling to use a “direct” tactic of reason. It seems that the negative result of the comparison of spouses’ resources in terms of their physical attractiveness is negatively viewed within marriage, especially by husbands. The reason which underlies the situation is the fact that it is female beauty rather than male physical attractiveness which is valued more highly by the society, and is traditionally considered to be a peculiar form of dowry that a woman brings into the marriage.

Summing up, the survey findings prove that the influence strategies used in marriage seem to be strongly associated with the power relations which exist within this kind of relationship. This power is frequently based on physical attractiveness (the type of power wielded mostly by wives), and on financial resources (it is mainly husbands who hold this kind of power). At the same time, a strong correlation was discovered between influence tactics adopted in marriage and the subjective sense of marital satisfaction. Then again, a wife or a husband being the source of this satisfaction might turn out to be the spouses who possess different types of power within the marriage.

References

- AIDA, Y., FALBO, T. (1991). Relationships between marital satisfaction, resources, and power strategies. *Sex Roles*, 24, 43—56.
- ANDERSON, C., BERDAHL, J.L. (2002). The experience of power: Examining the effects of power on approach and inhibition tendencies. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 83, 6, 1362—1377.
- BEACH, S.R.H., TESSER, A. (1993). Decision making power and marital satisfaction. A self-evaluation maintenance perspective. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 12, 471—494.
- BECKMAN, L.J., HARVEY, S.M., SATRE, S.J., WALKER, M.A. (1999). Cultural beliefs about social influence strategies of Mexican immigrant women and their heterosexual partners. *Sex Roles*, 40, 11—12, 871—892.
- BELK, S., SNELL, W.E., GARCIA-FALCONI, R., HERNANDEZ-SANCHES, J., HARGROVE, L., HOLTZMAN, W.H. (1988). Power strategy use in the intimate relationships of women and men from Mexico and United States. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 14, 439—447.
- BEM, S.L. (1974). The measurement of psychological androgyny. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 42, 155—162.

- BLOOD, R.O. Jr., WOLFE, D.M. (1960). *Husbands and Wives*. New York: Free Press.
- BLUMSTEIN, P., SCHWARTZ, P. (1983). *American Couples: Money, Work, Sex*. New York: Morrow.
- BUSS, D.M., GOMES, M., HIGGINS, D.S., LAUTERBACH, K. (1987). Tactics of manipulation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52, 6, 1219—1229.
- BUSS, D.M. (1990). International preferences in selecting mates. A study of 37 cultures. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 21, 5—47.
- CARTWRIGHT, D.W., ZANDER, A. (Eds). (1968). *Group Dynamics: Research and Theory*. New York: Harper & Row.
- DOLIŃSKI, D. (2000). *Psychologia wpływu społecznego*. Wrocław: Towarzystwo Przyjaciół Ossolineum.
- DOLIŃSKI, D. (2005). *Techniki wpływu społecznego*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe SCHOLAR.
- FALBO, T. (1977). The multidimensional scaling of power strategies. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 35, 537—548.
- FALBO, T., PEPLAU, L.A. (1980). Power strategies in intimate relationship. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 38, 618—628.
- FISKE, S.T. (1993). Controlling other people: The impact of power on stereotyping. *American Psychologist*, 48, 621—628.
- FRENCH, J.R.P. Jr., RAVEL, B. (1959). The bases of social power. In: D. CARTWRIGHT (Ed.). *Studies in Social Power*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- HOWARD, J.A., BLUMSTEIN, P., SCHWARTZ, P. (1986). Sex, power, and influence tactics in intimate relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51, 102—109.
- JOHNSON, P. (1976). Women and power: Toward a theory of effectiveness. *Journal of Social Issues*, 32, 99—110.
- KELTNER, D., GRUENFELD, D.H., ANDERSON, C. (2003). Power, approach, and inhibition. *Psychological Review*, 110, 2, 265—284.
- KIPNIS, D., SCHMIDT, S., WILKINSON, I. (1980). Intraorganizational influence tactics: Explorations in getting one's way. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 65, 440—452.
- KIPNIS, D. (1972). Does power corrupt? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 24, 33—41.
- KIPNIS, D. (1976). *The Power Holders*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- KIPNIS, D., CASTELL, P.J., GERGEN, M., MAUCH, D. (1976). Metamorphic effects of power. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 61, 127—135.
- KUCZYŃSKA, A. (1992). *Inwentarz do oceny płci psychologicznej. Podręcznik*. Warszawa: Pracownia Testów Psychologicznych Polskiego Towarzystwa Psychologicznego.
- MANDAL, E. (2005). *Skala taktyki manipulacji w bliskim związku. Tłumaczenie i adaptacja skali Tactics of Manipulation autorstwa Davida Bussa*. Materiały niepublikowane.
- MANDAL, E. (2008). *Miłość, władza i manipulacja w bliskich związkach*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.

- MUELLER, U., MAZUR, A. (1997). Facial dominance in *Homo sapiens* as honest signaling of male quality. *Behavioral Ecology*, 8, 569—579.
- NEĆKI, Z. (1990: *Wzajemna atrakcyjność*. Warszawa: Wiedza Powszechna.
- PEPLAU, L.A., COCHRAN, S., ROOK, K., PADESKY, C. (1978). Loving women: Attachment and autonomy in lesbian relationships. *Journal of Social Issues*, 34, 7—27.
- RODMAN, H. (1972). Marital power, and the theory of resources in cultural context. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, 3, 50—69.
- RUSBULT, C.E. (1983). A longitudinal test of the investment model: The development (and deterioration) of satisfaction and commitment in heterosexual involvements. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 45, 101—117.
- WALLER, W.W., HILL, R. (1951). *The Family, a Dynamic Interpretation*. New York: Warner Books.